

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 93 19:14:51 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #266  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Tue, 27 Jul 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    266

Today's Topics:

                    ARRL and it's members  
                    Call sign snobbery  
                    Give a VE \$5.60, walk  
Lead the Way! (was Re: 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References f  
                    Real CBers  
STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep! (2 msgs)  
                    Wash Cnty, OR Antenna Ordinance - HELP !!  
                    Written CW (Was: Re: Real CBers) (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 27 Jul 1993 14:14:35 -0400  
From: panix!not-for-mail@nyu.arpa  
Subject: ARRL and it's members  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <sg6B8B6w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com  
> (robert) writes:

>

>Fair enough, Ed. Most of the discussion on this newgroup has centered  
>around the Codeless Technician license. First of all, the ARRL \*is\* the  
>representative organization by and for the amateur radio community in  
>the United States. Several years ago, the ARRL (after receiving support  
>from our fraternity, including mine) put forth a proposal to the FCC that  
>a codeless entry-level license be created. This license would convey all

>amateur privileges 222 MHz (then 220) and above.

>

>My question for you is, why didn't this proposal pass, and why do we now  
>have something completely different than what we approved?

>

It seems to me that this is a case of apples and oranges.

The FCC makes the rules we operate under. The ARRL's proposal and comments were not the only ones received by the FCC.

And they're just that: proposals and comments. The FCC is obligated to receive them, but they aren't required to agree with the ARRL (or, for that matter, anyone else).

So the FCC decided to implement a codefree license class differently than that proposed by the ARRL.

That's how it works.

73, Andy

--

```
----- Andrew Funk, KB7UV -----  
|      Chair, Radio Amateur Telecommunications Society (RATS)      |  
| ENG Editor/Microwave Control, WCBS-TV Channel 2 News, New York |  
| Internet: kb7uv@panix.com      Packet: kb7uv@kb7uv.#nli.ny.usa |
```

-----  
Date: 28 Jul 93 00:23:01 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Call sign snobbery  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> \* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*  
>  
> KK6JQ = 9+3+9+3+11+3+13+3+13+7 = 74 units long! No wonder you  
> want to liberalize code requirements! :->

Hmmm... so lets see....

KD1NR = 9+3+7+3+17+3+5+3+7 = 57 units... not too bad.

Tony

```
-----  
o      o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE  
 \    / system @ garlic.sbs.com      Soon W5YI VE
```

I say:

N7WIM = 5 + 3 + 13 + 3 + 9 + 3 + 4 + 3 + 7 = 50 units

But, Mr Pelican, I have one of those crummy 1 + 3 calls ... but I don't think I'll change it!

Kevin Purcell N7WIM / G8UDP  
a-kevinp@microsoft.com  
Sit simplex, stulte!

-----  
Date: 27 Jul 93 04:52:57 GMT  
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!system@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

floyd@nraven.wariat.org (Douglas Dever) writes:

> as a final note: I'd like to see the finals on that 80m radio with the  
> tuner and the 11M antenna....

Actually I'd say the finals would be in very good shape. It's been said that with a good tuner, you could actually tune a set of bedsprings. Matter of fact, people are actually using Slinky antennas, and they tune alright.

Tony

-----  
o o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE  
 \ / system @ garlic.sbs.com Soon W5YI VE  
 \\_\_/  
 (oo) Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.  
 /| \ /  
 / | {MTV} | | MooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's  
 \* | | { } | |  
 | | ----- | | (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)  
 ^^ ^^  
-----

-----  
Date: Tue, 27 Jul 93 17:33:50 GMT  
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!  
umn.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!  
lando.la.locus.com!dana@network.  
Subject: Lead the Way! (was Re: 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References f

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <kg5B8B4w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>

>>

>> Thank you, Paul. New hams will spend their money on the radio which  
>> will get them the most people to talk to. So happens that 2m is where the  
>> party is, that is where the new people will go, too.

>I hate to be a "party pooper" Dana, but I believe there are more people  
>to talk to on, say 20 or 15 meters, than two meters. I'm delighted to  
>hear that all the new hams will go there, though.

I recall the context of this thread was new Technician operators, i.e.,  
50 Mhz and above. Given Techs do not have 20m privileges, your delight  
at seeing the new hams on 20m will be short-lived.

>> \* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

>I believe that's obvious. Would you support beefed-up written exams,  
>with perhaps the removal of the published question pool?

I would support alternative tests of skill. What this practically means,  
is that an applicant would pass the current writtem exams, as they stand,  
and also pass one of a selection of skill tests. The skill tests would  
each focus on some skill salient to the radio art, such as CW, circuit  
design, computer programming, etc. Written tests of skill would have to  
be sufficiently large that memorization of the answers is not practical,  
or they would need to use an essay format. Essay format is attractive,  
but would be much more difficult for VEs to consistently grade.

I do not believe that removing published question pools would be of great  
value, witness the Dick Bash phenomena of the late 1970's.

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer

\*

\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1993 19:25:21 GMT

From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.kei.com!  
das.wang.com!wang!dbushong@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Real CBers  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

swamik@orca.NoSubdomain.NoDomain (Swami Kumaresan) writes:  
^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

Huh?

>>>rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu (Mr. Nice Guy) writes:

>>> I seem to remember that shortly after the big CB bust when CB went to 40  
>>> channels that many of real CBers learned to talk in Morris and got  
>>>  
>>> Rev. Rod (genuwin mail order minister)

>>Learned to talk in Morris? Negatory, Good Buddy. That's Morse,  
>>like horse. Ten-Four?

>> --Robert

>Yeah, and thats GENUINE, now u try it, G-E-N-U-I-N-E

>God! What an .. -.. .. --- - !

>-.. . -.- -.... .----- .- -- -.... -...- .- .-

>-----

>Swami Kumaresan  
>swamik@orca.ele.uri.edu  
>swamik@morio.e-technik.uni-kl.de  
>KB1AMB@KA1AZ.RI (Ham Radio BBS)  
>kb1amb@kb1amb.ampr.org AMPRNet (Amateur Packet Radio TCP/IP Network)

>KB1AMB/AA Advanced Class Amateur Radio Operator  
>I Monitor 147.165/.765 Repeater  
>& 20 meter band (SSB & CW)

>73s

Just out of curiosity, Swami, was the "Best Wisheses" at the end of  
your sig directed to the 'idiot' you were flaming or to the rest of  
us?

--

Dave Bushong, Wang Laboratories, Inc. Amateur Radio Callsign KZ10

Project Leader, Recognition products      kz1o@n0ary.#noca.ca.na  
Internet: dbushong@wang.com

-----  
Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1993 16:22:41 GMT  
From: concert!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!linus!linus.mitre.org!mitre.org!  
eubanks@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <22ojraINNd76@sweetpea.genrad.com> dls@genrad.com (Diana L. Carlson) writes:

>>..(moaning/complaining deleted)  
> I suspect the story is the same with W5YI and all other VECs.  
>  
> THANK YOU, ARRL AND W5YI AND ALL THE REST, FOR THE SERVICES YOU PROVIDE.  
>  
> It would be nice to hear more positive items on this net instead of the  
> constant code-nocode battles, or the incessant ARRL criticisms and  
blamings.  
> I know, that WOULD be asking too much.

"Amen, Diana. A voice of truth crying in the wilderness!". [AND THANKS  
for your work on Hamstacks, it is an excellent program.]

I also am a VE and loyal member of the League. Please no flames on  
League loyalty, it is of no concern to the issue at hand - stressful  
delays for a ticket. Stick to the subject and possible solutions - maybe  
this can be fixed.

Ignoring nastiness and rudeness, the moans and complaints do echo a real  
problem - those long delays in waiting for that first ticket. If one  
organization appears to get results a little faster, no matter, the delay  
is still greater than it ought to be. Every new successful examinee goes  
through 2 and a half months of great stress waiting to get on the air. I  
remember my first exam back in 1957 - I waited for the postman every day  
(just to do low powered, crystal controlled CW), it was 8-9 weeks then too.

I would like to see a VE-issued, temporary callsign that allows operation  
at the earned level of achievement, or a subset - say just VHF privileges,  
until the actual ticket arrives. The callsigns could be of a unique  
format, something like "WT9876AB"; where "WT" or "WN" correspond to Tech or  
Novice; "9876" corresponds to a specific VE session & is assigned in  
blocks by the VEC organization. The format provides an expiration code  
derived from the specific VE session - say, the last day of the 3rd month  
following the session. The local examiners retain the particulars on the  
call/name/address/date. Another format is fine if there's a problem with

this one.

This solution is easy to implement and requires no upgrading of federal computing facilities. It is basically an adaptation of the temporary upgrade process. Legitimate neo-licensees pose no new threat to ham radio, we already have bootleggers on all bands and non-bands using someone else's call (I've heard my own - maybe you've heard yours too). A new operator is no more dangerous to the local repeater on the day of the exam than 9 weeks later.

Vern Eubanks, AA7EI  
"eubanks@mitre.org"

These are my personal opinions only.

-----  
Date: 27 Jul 93 04:40:24 GMT  
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!system@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

bjahnke@arrl.org (Bart Jahnke) writes:

>>What size does the license copy have to be trimmed to?  
>  
> To the border of the pocket or certificate sized license (where it  
> states to "cut along this line").

Bart,

Isn't this sort of a ridiculous requirement of the FCC? I'm surprised that nobody has seen fit to introduce a proposal to eliminate that part of the process.

Tony

-----  
o o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE  
 \ / system @ garlic.sbs.com Soon W5YI VE  
 \\_\_/  
 (oo) Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.  
 /| \_\_\_ \/  
/ | {MTV} || MooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's  
\* || {\_\_\_} ||  
 ||-----|| (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)  
 ^^ ^^  
-----

-----  
Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1993 19:14:59 GMT  
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!linac!att!att!  
bigtop!longs!n2ic@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Wash Cnty, OR Antenna Ordinance - HELP !!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

-----  
Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1993 17:27:18 GMT  
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!news@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Written CW (Was: Re: Real CBers)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <gBgc8B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

> ( . and - CW deleted )  
> Hummmmm....I always thought Morse was a aural language.  
> ...

Does anyone else have problems decoding the . and - CW that people have been posting in this thread? I mean, I can copy 20 or so wpm by ear but have a difficult time with the 'written' CW. I have to hum it to myself before I can 'copy' it. I guess once you learn it in one sensory medium it's difficult to transfer it to another.

No profound conclusions, just a remark on something I find interesting.

73... Mark AA7TA

-----  
Date: 27 Jul 1993 19:48:53 GMT  
From: cthomas@athena.mit.edu  
Subject: Written CW (Was: Re: Real CBers)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jul27.172718.23080@newsgate.sps.mot.com> rapw20@email.sps.mot.com writes:

>  
>Does anyone else have problems decoding the . and - CW that people  
>have been posting in this thread? I mean, I can copy 20 or so wpm by  
>ear but have a difficult time with the 'written' CW. I have to hum  
>it to myself before I can 'copy' it. I guess once you learn it in one  
>sensory medium it's difficult to transfer it to another.



I found I actually could copy faster when seeing it then with hearing it.

--... ..-- ... . .-- ... ..-- ..

--Michael T. Ford  
cthomas@MIT.edu  
wz0c@wz0c.ampr.org  
wz0c@walphy.#ema.ma.usa

-----  
Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1993 19:22:48 GMT  
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.kei.com!  
das.wang.com!wang!dbushong@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Written CW (Was: Re: Real CBers)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

markm@bigfoot.sps.mot.com (Mark Monninger) writes:

>In article <gBgc8B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert)  
>writes:  
>> ( . and - CW deleted )  
>> Hummmmm....I always thought Morse was a aural language.  
>> ...

>Does anyone else have problems decoding the . and - CW that people  
>have been posting in this thread? I mean, I can copy 20 or so wpm by  
>ear but have a difficult time with the 'written' CW. I have to hum  
>it to myself before I can 'copy' it. I guess once you learn it in one  
>sensory medium it's difficult to transfer it to another.

>No profound conclusions, just a remark on something I find interesting.

I find the same thing, whether it's in a newsgroup, or if it happens  
to be on a bumper sticker, etc. I have to hum it and listen to myself  
so that the letters emerge. I usually QSO at 20 to 40 wpm in CW. But  
I can't hum that fast.

Dave

--

Dave Bushong, Wang Laboratories, Inc.      Amateur Radio Callsign KZ10  
Project Leader, Recognition products      kz1o@n0ary.#noca.ca.na  
Internet: dbushong@wang.com

-----

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 93 18:12:39 GMT

From: mentor.cc.purdue.edu!noose.ecn.purdue.edu!en.ecn.purdue.edu!n9ljx@purdue.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul23.122412.19994@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>,

<22ovicINNju2@topaz.bds.com>, <930725.130411.9t0.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>

Subject : Re: ARRL and it's members

In article <930725.130411.9t0.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com> system@garlic.sbs.com  
(Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>

>Section Manager? Are you serious? The guy who blows off an engagement to  
>speak at a club meeting, the guy who never answers his mail, the same  
>guy who fails to submit section news? Sorry, but come time for him to be  
>re-elected I'd like to see his butt get tossed.

>

>Tony

>

>-----  
> o o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE  
> \ / system @ garlic.sbs.com Soon W5YI VE

The only sure-fire way of doing this is by being involved enough to vote him  
out. Maybe run against him, or at least help in a campaign for his  
opposition. B&Ming on usenet is not likely to have the desired results!

--scott

--

Scott Stambaugh - N9LJX

internet: n9ljx@ecn.purdue.edu

Operations Supervisor, ADPC

phone: 317 494 7946

Purdue University

West Lafayette, IN 47907-1061

-----

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 93 16:27:01 GMT

From: overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!umn.edu!csus.edu!

netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!lando.la.locus.com!

dana@@dog.ee.lbl.gov

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CAKz25.751@srgenprp.sr.hp.com>, <231qfnINNsgp@kralizec.zeta.org.au>,

<1993Jul27.123854.29419@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>e

Subject : Re: Code/NoCode

In article <1993Jul27.123854.29419@rsg1.er.usgs.gov> bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (Tom  
Bodoh) writes:

>--

>Since the anti-no-coders seem convinced that learning code is a necessary  
>hurdle because it requires some level of effort - why not allow hams to  
>substitute a course in French for the code requirement? It could prove  
>to be more useful in worldwide HF communications...

The anti-no-code lot overlooks the purpose of the US amateur radio service as spelled out in CFR 47 Part 97.1. I quoted the entire section in a recent posting, so I'm not going to type it in again.

The CW requirement was not included in the amateur testing just because it requires effort and hence will keep the bad apples out of ham radio.

CW at one time was an important commercial and military operating mode. Radio operators with higher speed CW skills were of greater value to the country, and the amateur service made an effort to increase the number of such operators.

Now that CW is declining in popularity among commercial and military operations, it is time to ask the question "How can amateur radio continue to provide a reserve of valuable radio operators?".

Many of the "reasons" given for the CW test are modern rationalizations. "Keeping out the slackers" was never the intention of the CW test. It can be argued, I believe, that the CW test was once a useful test of skill; at this point, why don't we identify the skills that are valuable in building a reserve of trained operators, and offer the applicant a choice of skill tests in addition to the current written exams? Keep in mind the skill test could also be a written exercise, but would require demonstration of skill, not a knowledge of theory rules.

>Actually, I'm not anti-code - I just thought I'd point out that if broadening  
>your communication opportunities is a goal, there may be other alternatives...

100% agreed. Maybe one of the skill tests could be one of diplomacy; fortunately for the anti-no-codes, they wouldn't have to fail it ;-)

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----  
Date: 27 Jul 93 18:32:22 GMT

From: unix.sri.com!headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csl!paulf@hplabs.hpl.hp.com

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CArxt0.71x@egr.uri.edu>, <iNcB8B7w165w@balsam.pinetree.org>,  
<CAsxp1.J2D@mentor.cc.purdue.edu>  
Subject : Re: Damn the torpedoes (was Re: 1947 No Code )

In <CAsxp1.J2D@mentor.cc.purdue.edu> blumb@sage.cc.purdue.edu (Bill Blum) writes:

>What does learning code have to do with building a satellite rig?

Well, not much, except if you actually want to \*use\* your satellite rig, since  
CW is one the most dominant modes on the Satellites, and by far the easiest  
to gear for.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."  
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, \_A Nation of Victims\_

-----  
Date: 28 Jul 93 00:32:59 GMT  
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!rcanders@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <iNcB8B7w165w@balsam.pinetree.org>, <CAsxp1.J2D@mentor.cc.purdue.edu>,  
<1993Jul27.183222.24223@Csl1.Stanford.EDU>  
Subject : Re: Damn the torpedoes (was Re: 1947 No Code )

In article <1993Jul27.183222.24223@Csl1.Stanford.EDU> paulf@Csl1.Stanford.EDU  
(Paul Flaherty) writes:

>In <CAsxp1.J2D@mentor.cc.purdue.edu> blumb@sage.cc.purdue.edu (Bill Blum) writes:  
>

>>What does learning code have to do with building a satellite rig?

>

>Well, not much, except if you actually want to \*use\* your satellite rig, since  
>CW is one the most dominant modes on the Satellites, and by far the easiest  
>to gear for.

Not if you are using the microsats for packet.

--

Rod Anderson N0NZO | "I do not think the United States government  
Boulder, CO | is responsible for the fact that a bunch of  
rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu | fanatics decided to kill themselves"  
satellite N0NZO on ao-16 | Slick Willie the Compassionate

-----

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1993 17:35:35 GMT  
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!msuinfo!  
uchinews!hayward@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul22.192048.28231@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com>,  
<1993Jul24.042735.5428@anomaly.sbs.com>, <CANwn8.Dpz@news.Hawaii.Edu>  
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

In article <CANwn8.Dpz@news.Hawaii.Edu>  
jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:  
:In article <1993Jul24.042735.5428@anomaly.sbs.com>  
kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes: :>

:>Bullshit.  
:^^^^^^^^  
:I've never heard a Reverend say that word before..... :

Well, I cannot address what people of the cloth say or should not say;  
however, I have observed that people who feel it necessary to use a  
title such as this in situations where it is not called for are either  
conceited or insecure.

Kristin Rachael Hayward

--

-----  
Kristin Rachael Hayward                      University of Maine                      WX9T  
kristin@gandalf.umcs.maine.edu    (yes, I know I didn't post from there)

-----  
Date: (null)  
From: (null)  
It sounds like you guys in Washington County, Oregon, are going through  
the same thing that we went through in Boulder County, Colorado 7 years  
ago.

Prior to 1986, Boulder County had absolutely no regulations pertaining to  
amateur radio antennas. When the sh!t hit the fan, the local hams made  
every attempt reach a reasonable compromise with the county. The county  
just spit in our face. Their own "Planning Commission" recommended a 70  
foot limit in residential areas, and 100 feet in rural areas, but when  
it went to the ever-powerful County Commissioners, it was decided that  
the building height limits (35 and 50 feet) shall apply - period ! And,  
of course, a single tower, not multiple towers. Any exceptions require  
a special use permit (which now costs \$400). What an honor - spend \$400,  
be told you are dirt by all your neighbors, be told NO by the commissioners.

Then you can go to Federal Court, using the "power" of PRB-1. We all know where that went with the NQOI case !

I know it sucks going from a no-regulation situation to having regulations, but, compared to Boulder County, Colorado, I would accept the "C-ENGROSSED" ordinance before your government catches wind of the NQOI and NOMRW PRB-1 cases.

Steve London, N2IC/0

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #266

\*\*\*\*\*